



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,580	07/27/2001	Shinya Uchida	0397-0431P	8191

2292 7590 02/24/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

COOK, LISA V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,580

Applicant(s)

UCHIDA ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa V. Cook

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment Entry

1. Applicant's response to the office action mailed 06 September 2002 is acknowledged. In amendment-A filed therein the specification along with 1, 4, and 5 were amended; while new claim 11 was added.
2. Currently, claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration.

Remarks

3. Examiner acknowledges the erroneous check-off of box 13 in the office action summary mailed 9/6/02. Box #14 should have been checked and is correctly identified in the instant response (office action summary).

OBJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

Information Disclosure Statement

4. Document number B22 912413 filed 4/9/99 in Japan has not been considered because an English translation was not filed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Applicants note that JP-B 22-912413 corresponds to Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No.HEI 291990)-81749, which corresponds to US patent #5,527,714 to Kosako. Further, Applicants have provided an English abstract of JP 2(1990)-81749. Accordingly the objection is withdrawn.

Specification

5. The specification has been amended to eliminate the cited objections below:

I The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application. (i.e. Sysmex on pages 8 and 12). They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

II The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference. The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973). Specifically the disclosure of Application No. 2000-226270 is incorporated in its entirety.

The objection to the specification is withdrawn.

OBJECTIONS MAINTAINED

Priority

6. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file. Application No. 2000-226270 filed in JAPAN 7/27/00.

Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a translation of the foreign application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

Applicants decline the Examiners invitation to incur the expense of providing an unnecessary certified English translation of the priority document at this time.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. For example see page 12. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner-on form PTO-892 or the applicant-on form PTO-1449 have cited the references they have not been considered.

REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1641

8. Claims 1-11 are withdrawn from rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

I. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamao et al. (US Patent #6,030,845) in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp – Abstract Only.

Art Unit: 1641

Yamao et al. disclose an immunoassay method for lysed whole blood. Antibodies in the sample (whole blood) are subjected to agglutination reaction with insoluble carriers or an insoluble particle suspension reagent on to which the antibodies or antigens are immobilized. The agglutination mixture may be lysed with a low osmotic solution, a solution of saponins, freeze/thawing, or by ultrasonication. The resulting agglutination reaction mixture is analyzed for the change in absorbance or in its light scatter by irradiation. See abstract and column 2, lines 9-67.

Yamao et al. differ from the instant invention in not teaching agglutination before the introduction of an erythrocyte-lysing agent (hemolysis).

However, in patent JP 60047962 hemolyzing agents directed to erythrocyte lysing are employed. A whole blood sample is treated with polystyrene latex sensitized with human gamma globulin (to initiate agglutination) and the sensitized latex was mixed with 0.5% Bovine serum albumin and 0.4% saponin (hemolysing agent) to form a reagent for the detection of rheumatoid factor in whole blood. See abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to agglutinate before utilizing the lysing agent as taught by Terumo Corp (JP60047962) in the method of Yamao et al. because Terumo Corp (JP60047962) taught that "hemolyzing agents cause hemolysis of erythrocytes which interfere with the agglutination reaction". See abstract. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to agglutinate prior to lysing to eliminate the interference exhibited when the process is reversed.

Art Unit: 1641

II. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamao et al (U.S.Patent #6,030,845) in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp – Abstract Only and in further view of Bester et al. (Analytical Biochemistry, Vol. 223, No.2, pages 299-305, 1994).

Please see Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp are set forth above.

Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching the utility of an erythrocyte-lysing agent (such as sodium dodecyl sulfate) to lyse erythrocytes.

However Bester et al. teach methods of employing and optimizing lysing agents like sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS). See abstract. Bester et al. further disclose that the use of SDS with fluorescent dyes could be optimized to quantify DNA in cell cultures. See page 299 2nd column 1st paragraph.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ SDS as a lysing agent to lyse cells as taught by Bester et al. in the method of Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp because Bester et al. taught that SDS was effective in cell dissolution. See page 299, 2nd column, 1st paragraph. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to incorporate the SDS in cellular analysis to therein take advantage of its known dissociation properties.

III. Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamao et al. (U.S.Patent #6,030,845) in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp – Abstract Only and further in view of Kosako (U.S.Patent #5,527,714) and Cohen et al. (U.S.Patent #4,851,329).

Please see Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp as set forth above.

Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp fail to particularly teach flow cytometry analysis, particle size, and particle to sample ratios.

However, Kosako disclose a method for determining particle size distributions with respect to an analyte via mediated particle agglutination. The method involves the utility of antigen/antibody reactions to concentrated sensitized insoluble carriers into non-aggregated and aggregated particles of known size.

The analyte is analyzed by an electronic analyzer to detect the quantity and size distribution of concentrated non-aggregated and aggregated insoluble carriers resulting from the antigen/antibody reaction, as well as spurious particles that may be present in the analyte. See column 1 line 65 through column 2 line 9. The calculation with respect to T and M as recited in claim 6 is taught by Kosako (5,527,714) column 4 lines 36-50.

Cohen et al. also disclose a method of determining the concentration of antibody and antigen molecules with high specificity, accuracy, and sensitivity. The process can be used to determine concentration of any substance capable of promoting or inhibiting an agglutination reaction. See abstract. The process is based on the relationship between cluster size of aggregated particles and the intensity of light scatter from the particles as they traverse a beam of focused light. Column 2 lines 62-67. The particle size range from 0.03 up to about 5-10 microns. Column 4, lines 24-26. In the example in column 7 the mixture of particle to sample was taught to be 1:11 (see column 7 lines 54-55).

Art Unit: 1641

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the flow analysis teachings of Kosako and Cohen et al. into the method of Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp because Kosako taught that his method detected small percentages of an analyte with improved sensitivity and decreased sample preparation time. Column 1 lines 30-34. The agglutination process further allowed for spurious particle elimination Column 2 lines 10-16. While, Cohen et al. taught that his method resulted in high intrinsic sensitivity and specificity of the agglutination reaction, improved light scatter detection, while identifying contaminants. Column 6 line 57 through column 7 line 25.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to measure agglutination in flow cytometry particle analyses to more accurately measure the analyte with various particle parameters thus allowing for increased data sets for consideration and evaluation.

IV. Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamao et al. (U.S. Patent #6,030,845) in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp – Abstract Only and further in view of Holmes (U.S. Patent #4,830,969).

Please see Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp are set forth above.

Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp differ from the instant invention in not teaching the immune agglutination reaction temperature and time recited in claim 10.

However Holmes disclose a process for the separation of cellular materials. The cellular material is heated in a solution of lysing agent (including surfactants) to agglomerate water-soluble nitrogen containing compounds. See abstract.

Art Unit: 1641

In general the temperature is between about 60° and about 105°C., preferably between 80° and 105°C. The time is between about 10 seconds and about 3 minutes. Column 2, lines 54-63. Therein reading on the limitations of claim 10.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the temperature and time ranges taught by Holmes in the method of Yamao et al. in view of JP 60047962 to Terumo Corp because Holmes taught that this process (temp and time) allowed one to separate agglomeration resistant water soluble nitrogen containing cellular organic compounds like nucleic acids and peptides from other cellular materials. Column 2, lines 1-9.

Further the need for isolating plasmids and other nucleic acids has become critical due to the extremely rapid growth of microbiological analysis and genetic engineering. Column 1, lines 56-65.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to utilize the process taught by Holmes because it was rapid, simple, and inexpensive. Column 1 lines 51-55.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant contends that the cited references did not teach the instant invention because they taught hemolysis prior to agglutination. The instant invention is directed to a process wherein the sample is agglutinated first and subsequently hemolyzed. This argument was found persuasive. Accordingly the Yamao et al. was withdrawn from rejection under 102(b) and cited under 103(a) in conjunction with JP60047962. JP60047962 teaches processes of agglutinating

Art Unit: 1641

prior to hemolysis. It is also noted that a long list of cases have held that the mere use of different starting materials, whether novel or known, in a conventional process to produce the product one would expect there from does not render the process unobvious.

In re Surrey et al. (CCPA 1963) 318 F2d 233, 138 USPQ 67; *In re Kanter* (CCPA 1968) 399 F2d 249, 158 USPQ 331; *In re Larsen* (CCPA 1961) 292 F2d 531, 130 USPQ 209.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., use of a surfactant) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

With respect to the 103 rejections cited in items II through IV above, Applicant argues that the rejections must fail since the rejection of claim 1 is overcome. The argument was considered and found persuasive. Therein the rejections were modified to include the JP60047962 Patent.

Art Unit: 1641

11. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

Remarks

12. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure:

A. Lehnen (U.S. Patent #5,567,627) teach methods and reagents useful in the simultaneous and discrete analysis of multiple analytes.

B. Terstappen et al. (U.S. Patent #5,646,001) affinity-binding separation and release of one or more selected subset of biological entities from a mixed population thereof.


13. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 Fax number is (703) 308-4242, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (703) 305-0808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (703) 305-3399.

Art Unit: 1641

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Lisa V. Cook

CM1-7B17

(703) 305-0808

2/11/03



LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

02/21/03